

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/920,262	GILES-KOMAR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Prema M Mertz	1646	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Prema M Mertz (Primary Examiner). (3)_____.

(2) Eric Dichter (Attorney). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 26 October 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3 and 9.

Identification of prior art discussed: none.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Prema Mertz
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Dichtor contacted the Examiner to determine if the claims were rendered allowable by the last amendment. It was indicated to Mr. Dichtor that amending claim 1 to recite "comprising a heavy chain variable region (VH) of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:7 and a light chain variable region (VL) of amino acid sequence set forth in SEQ ID NO:8" would be allowable. In claim 3 the recitation of "substantially" was vague and indefinite (35 USC 112, second para rejection). Also claim 9 would be amended by attorney to mirror claim 1 .